United States

Merit Systems Protection Board

FY 2000 and 2001 Performance Plan

Table of Contents

AGENCYWIDE MISSION

The U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) is an independent quasi-judicial agency established to protect the integrity of the Federal merit systems against partisan political and other prohibited personnel practices and to ensure adequate protection for employees against abuses by agency management. This responsibility is carried out principally by, among other things:

1. Adjudicating employee appeals of personnel actions such as removal, suspensions, furloughs, and demotions;

2. Adjudicating cases brought by the Special Counsel;

3. Adjudicating actions brought under the Whistleblower Protection Act, USERRA, the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act;

4. Ordering compliance with final orders where appropriate;

5. Conducting studies of the Federal civil service to determine whether they are free from prohibited personnel practices; and

6. Reviewing regulations of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to ensure that they do not require or result in the commission of a prohibited personnel practice.

ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY

?   The MSPB provides a system of accountability herein, that requires each of the program managers, in coordination with the Members of the Board, to accept responsibility for identifying program objectives and for setting realistic, measurable goals for future performance. It has been established to ensure the customers of the agency that a systematic measurement of results and reporting of program performance will take place.

BUDGET ACTIVITY -ADJUDICATION

REGIONAL OPERATIONS -FIRST LEVEL REVIEW/INITIAL APPEALS

Mission

The Office of Regional Operations (ORO) through a network of 10 Regional and Field offices is responsible for adjudicating appeals which arise under the Federal civil service laws and other related laws.

Outcomes

In order to ensure that merit principles are protected, the intended results (outcomes) of ORO's efforts are to:

1. Increase assurances through the adjudicatory process that agencies comply with Civil Service laws; and

2. Provide better service to our appellate customers through efficient operations.

Goals

Goal   **1**

Protect And Promote The Federal Merit Systems Through Fair, Timely, And Efficient Adjudication And Alternative Dispute Resolution

Objectives

1. Issue high quality decisions, i.e., decisions that are held to be legally sound upon review by the Board and by the courts.

2. Issue initial decisions within 120 days.

3. Cut costs devoted to adjudicating appeals.

Strategies

1. Evaluate regional decisions to determine if categories of cases can be identified where decisions are overturned, and/or remanded more often. Implement corrective action in appropriate situations.

2. Evaluate ways to reduce the processing time where appropriate by encouraging the use of emerging electronic file technology (e.g., e-mail filings; electronic appeal form).

3. Analyze costs of various types of appeals and direct action at reducing these costs.

4. Provide guidance and assist with training of Federal employees and agencies, unions, bar associations, etc., on the appeals process and dispute resolution.

5. Promote use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) procedures in order to resolve appealable matters at the lowest practicable level both during the ORO processing, and in other Federal agencies:

    *   Encourage agencies to attempt to resolve disputes in house;

    *   Establish a simplified appeal process(s) which allow quicker decisions in ORO; and

    *   Sponsor lessons learned symposia and other activities to share experiences and promote in house dispute resolution techniques.

6. Identify legislative changes that are helpful to allow ORO to adapt to a changing personnel management environment.

7. Apply technology to make the adjudicatory process more understandable and available:

   - Put precedential decisions and regulations on line;

   - Facilitate on-line legal research; and

   - Develop an interactive electronic appeal form and an electronic case file.

8. Relate individual and organizational goals, objectives, and performance standards and measures to annual performance goals.

<u>Performance Measures</u>

1. Percentage of decisions upheld upon review of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; i.e., the assumption is that the higher the number of decisions upheld, the higher the apparent quality of the decision.

2. Average case processing time; i.e., the sooner an appeal is resolved, the sooner justice is served.

3. Unit costs; i.e., lower ORO unit costs per total case would tend to indicate more efficient processing.

4. Feedback from agencies and our other constituents on the number of disputes resolved and costs saved by agency ADR processes.

Indicator   1

Percent of Cases Upheld by Federal Circuit Court

Percent of Cases Upheld by Federal Circuit Court			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
% Board Cases Upheld	95%	94%	94%
% Regional Cases Upheld	96%	97%	97%

Indicator 2

Average Case Processing Time

Average Case Processing Time For Initial Decisions			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Average Processing Days	108	105	100

Indicator 3

Average Processing Cost

Average Processing Cost (1998 baseline, discounted for inflation)			
Item	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Dollars	$2,650	$2,850	$3,050

Indicator 4

Increased Awareness of ADR

Increased Awareness And Utilization By Agencies Of ADR Process To Settle Potential Appeals Before They Are Filed With MSPB.

1. With input from our customers we will facilitate the training of agency employees in using ADR processes to settle potential appeals to MSPB before they are filed.

2. We will work with selected agencies to assist them to implement dispute prevention programs that will attempt to settle selected potential appeals before they are filed with MSPB.

3. We will receive feedback from agencies and other constituents on their experiences with using dispute prevention processes to settle potential appeals to MSPB.

Program Evaluation

1. Data maintained in our financial and case management systems will allow us to establish a baseline and provide the information needed to consistently monitor progress.

2. Periodic customer surveys and focus groups.

3. Comparative evaluations of agencies which have implemented dispute prevention programs with ORO's assistance.

APPEALS COUNSEL - SECOND LEVEL REVIEW/ PETITION FOR REVIEW

Mission

Appellants and/or agencies who are unhappy with the outcome of an appeal at the Initial Appeal stage may file a Petition for Review. The Office of Appeals Council (OAC) is responsible for providing the three members of the Merit Systems Protection Board with recommended decisions in these cases which assists the Board in performing its adjudicatory functions.

OAC is responsible for:

1. Recommending to the Board appropriate dispositions in cases pending before the three member Board;

2. Complying with instructions by the Board to rewrite OAC's recommendations and providing the Board with further legal and factual analysis prompted by those rewrite instructions;

3. Providing individual Board members with further legal or factual analysis of cases in which OAC has made recommendations;

4. Identifying cases pending before the full Board which may be amenable to settlement by the parties to those cases and attempting to mediate settlement agreements in those cases and in cases where a majority of the Board or one of the parties requests that mediation be attempted;

5. Providing Board Offices and the customers of the Board a weekly synopsis of Board decisions and regulations and of federal agency and court decisions and regulations that may impact on the Board; and

6. Providing outreach efforts to the customers of the Board, especially regarding the Board's petition-for-review process.

Outcomes

The staff's efforts should result in:

1. The Board issuing decisions in a timely manner;

2. Decisions of the Board being sustained on judicial review;

3. Decisions of the Board being viewed by parties as fair, legally correct, and clearly written;

4. A high rate of settlement in cases mediated by OAC; and,

5. A reduction in the number of rewrites by the Board.

Goals

Goal **2**

Dispute Resolution

Protect and promote the Federal merit systems through fair, timely, and efficient dispute resolution by promptly and efficiently providing the Board with high quality recommendations in cases pending before the Board.

Objectives

1. Increase the number of initial recommendations to the Board by 5% each year.

2. Maintain the current rate of settlement and attempt 8% more settlements each year.

3. Reduce average case processing time by 15 days each year.

4. Reduce the average case processing cost by 3% each year.

5. Reduce the percentage of rewrites by 12% each year.

Strategies

1. Analyze rewrite instructions to determine whether there is any pattern of recommendations by individual attorneys, teams, or the staff as a whole, where changes need to be made.

2. Seek ways to reduce the processing time through the use of technology, more efficient assignment and supervision of cases, and training of attorneys, paralegals, and support staff.

3. Examine ways to reduce the burden of non-case processing activities on managers, attorneys, and paralegals.

4. Work with the Professional Association to assure that the professional needs and expectations of attorneys are being met, consistent with the agency's goals and requirements.

5. Prepare briefer recommendations and recommended decisions, where appropriate, consistent with the expectations of the Board.

6. Relate individual and organizational goals, objectives, and performance standards and measures to annual performance goals.

7. Improve communications with the Board members and their staffs, other offices of the Board, and external customers to be more aware of problems and concerns with the staff's work products.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Number of Recommendations to the Board

Number of Recommendations to the Board			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Number	1,871	1,964	2,062

Indicator   2

PFR Settlements

PFR Settlement Team: Settlement Attempted, Settlement Achieved, & Success Rate			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Attempted	300	325	352
Achieved	81	90	95
Success Rate	27%	27%	27%

Indicator   3

Average Case Processing Time

Average Case Processing Time			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Days	217	210	205

Indicator 4

Average Processing Cost

Average Processing Cost			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Dollars	$1,573	$1,526	$1,480

Indicator 5

Rewrites

Percentage of Cases Returned to OAC for Rewriting			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Percentage	15%	13%	11%

Program Evaluation

1. Data maintained in our financial and case management systems will allow us to establish a baseline and provide the information needed to consistently monitor progress.

2. Periodic customer surveys and focus groups, especially with reference to settlement efforts.

BOARD OFFICES

Mission

To timely and efficiently make decisions relative to petitions for review and other legal matters before the Board.

Outcome

The intended outcome of the Board Office's efforts are timely resolution on the merits of cases.

Goals

Goal **3**

Facilitate The Reduction Of The Backlog Of Pending Appeals

Objectives

1. Track and provide feedback as to the status of pending cases throughout headquarters to assist other offices in identifying problem areas.

2. Identify systems inefficiencies and suggest modifications to improve the case flow.

Performance Measures

1. Amount of time to process cases in Board offices.

2. Number of cases pending for over one year at headquarters.

Indicator 1

Case Processing Time

Amount of Time to Process Cases in Board Offices			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Case Processing Time - Days	39	38	38

Indicator 2

Pending Cases

Average Number of Cases Pending Over One Year at Headquarters			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Pending over 1 year	73	50	50

Program Evaluation

The majority of the performance measures will be obtained from data collected by the case management system, feedback from the Chairman and other Members, the staffs of the Members, Federal Circuit decisions, and constituent outreach.

GENERAL COUNSEL

Mission

The Office of the General Counsel provides quality legal, legislative, and information services in a timely fashion to the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board.

Outcomes

The staff provides legal, legislative and information services and is responsible for:

1. Providing the Board with legal advice on a broad range of issues;

2. Preparing proposed decisions;

3. Achieving effective enforcement of decisions;

4. Providing information to the public in plain English;

5. Coordinating legislative policy; and

6. Providing congressional liaison functions.

Goals

Goal   **4**

Efficiently Produce And Deliver Quality Work Products

Objectives

1. Maximum efficiency, timely completion of work, and excellent work product through:

   - Highly qualified staff; and.

   - Technology applications--a paperless office.

Strategies

1. Convert internal paper files to electronic systems; e.g., brief bank, subject matter files.

2. Obtain commercial electronic services for application in staff work, e.g., legislative tracking services.

3. Identify priority training needs and target training to address specific technical and legal needs, including training to support supervisory functions.

4. Fill vacancies with employees with first-rate legal and computer skills.

5. Increase use of ADR techniques in enforcement cases.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Staff Documents Electronically Stored

Percentage of New Staff Documents Electronically Stored			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Electronic storage of new staff documents	0%	100%	100%

Indicator   2

Staff Documents Electronically Stored

Percentage of Existing Staff Documents Electronically Stored			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Electronic storage of existing staff documents	0%	25%	50%

Indicator   3

Use of Commercial Services

Percent of Tracking and Status Report Function Performed Through Commercial Electronic Service			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Commercial legislative electronic service	0%	100%	100%

Convert to commercial legislative electronic service only if feasible, i.e., it is a cost effective way to meet our needs.

Indicator   4

Training

Percentage of Priority Training Provided			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Training	0%	75%	80%

Indicator   5

Time to Process Cases

Amount of Time to Process All Non-Litigation Cases			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Case Processing Time - Days	163	153	147

The plan would reduce case processing time by 10% over two year period.

Program Evaluation

Periodic analysis and evaluation.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

<u>Mission</u>

The Administrative Law Judge protects the merit-based civil service system through adjudication of cases arising under federal laws and regulations.

<u>Outcomes</u>

In order to ensure that merit principles are protected, the intended result (outcome) is to increase assurances through the adjudicatory process that agencies comply with civil service laws.

<u>Goals</u>

Goal   5

Provide Fair, High-Quality, Timely, Customized, And Efficient Adjudication And ADR

<u>Objectives</u>

1. Insure that adjudication and ADR processes are fair, efficient, customized to meet variety of customer needs, and result in resolution at lowest level.

2. Insure that parties are aware of their rights and obligations.

3. Insure that products (e.g., decisions, orders, rulings at hearings, and actions regarding settlement) are fair, have the appearance of fairness, are of high quality, and are issued/made in timely manner.

<u>Strategies</u>

0   1. Offer and assist in arranging ADR in appropriate cases providing for quicker decisions and earlier finality.

1   2. Issue orders and rulings providing clear and comprehensive information to parties concerning their rights and obligations.

2   3. Issue high-quality decisions with pre-issuance quality review.

<u>Performance Measures</u>

1. Number of cases in which ADR is providing for quicker decisions and earlier finality is offered and agreed to by parties.

2. Number of Board and court decisions finding error in ALJ's decisions.

3. Number of decisions finding error.

Indicator   1

Number of Cases in Which ADR is Offered to Parties

Number Of Cases In Which ADR is Offered To Parties			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Number of Cases	4	8	12

Indicator   2

Number of Cases in Which ADR Used by Parties

Number of Cases in Which ADR Used by Parties			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Number of Cases	0	2	4

Indicator   3

Number of Decisions Finding Error

Number of Decisions Finding Error			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Number of Decisions	1	0	0

Program Evaluation

Data maintained in case management systems.

MINISTERIAL OPERATIONS

Mission

The Office of the Clerk of the Board is responsible for ensuring the timely and efficient accomplishment of the ministerial operations of the Board in support of its adjudicatory role; effectively manage its records, legal research, information, directives, and disclosure programs; and provide appropriate reference and research services through the law library.

The office accomplishes its mission through a staff of legal, professional and technical personnel. Responsibilities include:

1. Maintaining a system for the timely processing, recording and issuing of appellate and original jurisdiction cases; preparing and certifying records and indices to the appropriate court or administrative agency; making timely, accurate, and consistent rulings on procedural motions; making legal service of final Board orders and opinions and orders; and providing efficient and appropriate legal research and reference services;

2. Providing timely, accurate and consistent response to requests for information under the various disclosure laws and disseminating information and guidance to our general public, publishing regulatory documents in the Federal Register; and

3. Maintaining a formal system for the organization, maintenance and disposition of official records.

Outcomes

The intended outcomes of the staff's efforts are to ensure that:

1. Cases are timely processed and issued;

2. Board staff has appropriate and efficient management and research tools available;

3. Information is appropriately disseminated in accordance with applicable laws and regulations; and

4. Official records are appropriately maintained and disposed of.

Goals

1. Timely process appellate, original jurisdiction, EEOC and court cases.

2. Make precedential MSPB decisions widely and easily accessible to external customers.

3. Enhance the use of legal research tools through the efficient use of technology.

4. Timely and efficiently disseminate information to Board customers consistent with applicable disclosure laws.

5. Ensure that MSPB automated case tracking, case management and legal research systems remain technically current and are consistent with MSPB needs and budgetary considerations.

Goal **6**

Timely Process Appellate, Original Jurisdiction, EEOC And Court Cases

Objectives

1. Consistently process appellate, original jurisdiction, EEOC and court cases within authorized time frames. Ensure that not more than 5% of the cases exceed existing time standards due to administrative processing delays.

2. Reduce the number of voluminous records required to be reproduced for EEOC review.

Performance Measures

Indicator 1

Timely Case Processing

Timely Case Processing			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Cases Processed (Appellate, OJ, EEOC & CAFC)	2,800	2,900	2,900
Administrative Delays	168	145	116

Indicator 2

Voluminous EEOC Records

Voluminous EEOC Records			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Records Reproduced	99	125	125
Voluminous Records Reproduced	6	4	2

Program Evaluation

1. Workload reports will be monitored on an ongoing basis to measure progress. These reports show the average processing time for all Board cases and are indicators of the staff's success in achieving its goal.

2. Ongoing feedback from both internal and external customers will provide additional information as to progress. Ongoing dialog is maintained with other Board legal staff and feedback is constant. Ongoing dialog as to progress is also maintained with the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and the EEOC through OCB liaisons.

3. Ongoing evaluation of case processing will be conducted to eliminate unnecessary steps and to expand employee empowerment where appropriate.

4. Monitoring with data maintained in our case management system.

5. Periodic discussions with internal customers.

6. External customer feedback.

Goal **7**

Make Precedential MSPB Decisions Widely And Easily Accessible To External Board Customers

Objectives

1. Reduce the number of paper copies of MSPB decisions by 50%.

2. Implement ListServ.

3. Electronic distribution to publishers.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Reduction of Copies

Reduction of Copies			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Number Issued	1,900	2,000	2,000
Average Number of Paper Copies Reproduced	38,380	20,000[1]	10,000[2]

Indicator   2

Implement ListServ

Implement ListServ			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
See Goal 4			

Indicator   3

Electronic Distribution

Electronic Distribution			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Distribution of decisions to HIS	300	2,000	2,000
Distribution of decisions to West	150	2,000	2,000
Distribution of decisions to All publishers	1	2	6

[1] Estimated Annual Savings - $10,000

[2] Estimated Annual Savings - $20,000

Program Evaluation

1. Success in accomplishing goals will be based on external customer feedback and on the willingness of publishers to accept electronic versions of decisions through the MSPB website or by email.

2. The staff currently reproduces an average of 20 copies of each final order issued for distribution to the parties, regional and field offices, publishers and other agencies. A reduction of copies will indicate that electronic distribution is being implemented.

Goal   **8**

Enhance The Use Of Legal Research Tools Through The Efficient Use Of Technology

Objective

1. Convert parts of the library collection to electronic technology to achieve cost efficiencies and improve research capabilities.

2. Create optimal legal research tools for MSPB staff using electronic information.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Conversion of Collection

Conversion of Collection			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Paper publication sets converted to CD-ROM	7	7	3

Indicator 2

Optimal Research Tools

Optimal Research Tools			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Conversion of MSPB Decisions for Legal Research	800	1,600	2,000
Conversion of Federal Circuit Decisions	0	600	500
Implementation of New Research Databases	0	2	2

Program Evaluation

1. Progress in implementing the five-year Modernization Plan for the Library. By the end of FY2000, a variety of paper copies of the collection will be converted to electronic technology.

2. Enhanced and cost efficient research should be deployed Boardwide in FY2000.

3. Ongoing feedback from customers.

Goal **9**

Timely And Efficiently Disseminate Information To Board Customers Consistent With Applicable Disclosure Laws

Objectives

1. Ensure that the public has timely and equitable access to the agency's public information. This applies to information disclosed, disseminated, or otherwise made available to the public--regardless of form or format.

2. Maximize the dissemination of information by email or through the MSPB website.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Maximize Dissemination of Information

Maximize Dissemination of Information			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Subscribers to MSPB ListServ	0	1,000	2,000
Average monthly hits for FOIA Reading Room	0	500	1,000
Average number of files downloaded per month	30,000	42,000	52,5000

Program Evaluation

1. Paper copies of a variety of information is currently distributed to requesters. Although some of the information is available in electronic form on our website, the website will be expanded to include a Freedom of Information Act Reading Room. More documents and publications will become available and requesters will be encouraged to download required information from the website. As requesters become more familiar with the information available on our website, the number of requests for paper copies should decrease.

2. MSPB intends to implement a "listserv" for certain information such as Board opinions and orders. Requesters would be able to subscribe to the service and automatically receive copies as opinions as issued. Availability of listServ will be advertised via website and Federal Register notice.

3. Assessment of MSPB website "hit" reports. These comprehensive reports provide information about visitors to the website including information being downloaded.

4. Workload reports.

5. Ongoing customer feedback should tell us if they have problems with downloading information, or that they have difficulty with the format of information sent by email.

Goal **10**

Ensure That MSPB Automated Case Tracking, Case Management And Legal Research Systems Remain Technically Current And Are Consistent With MSPB Needs And Budgetary Considerations

Objectives

1. Upgrade of word processing software and implementation of document assembly and document management products.

2. Replace current case management system.

Indicator 1

Upgrade to Word 97, HotDocs & PC Docs

Upgrade to Word 97, HotDocs & PC Docs			
	FY99	**FY00**	**FY01**
Pilot participants	20	0	0
Persons trained	20	230	0
Upgrades deployed	20	230	0

Indicator 2

Replace CMS with Law Manager 98

Replace CMS with Law Manager 98			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Pilot participants	0	20	0
Persons trained	0	250	0
Full deployment	0	0	250

Program Evaluation

1. With contractor assistance, the Clerk of the Board has planned a phased installation of new software. Each phase will include a pilot period in which product performance will be evaluated and verified.

2. Workgroups, composed of a cross-section of MSPB employees, will provide continuous monitoring and feedback.

3. Regular progress briefings will occur with contractors, program and project managers. A schedule has been established for formal written reports.

4. After user training and full deployment of products, the Clerk of the Board will institute a system to monitor, evaluate, and assess user acceptability, adaptability and suggestions for changes/enhancements.

5. Personal assessment of product integration.

BUDGET ACTIVITY - MERIT SYSTEMS STUDIES

POLICY AND EVALUATION

Mission

The U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board was created by the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 to protect the public's interest in a civil service that is free of prohibited personnel practices and that operates in accord with the statutory merit system principles. Accordingly, one of the two major mission activities assigned to the Board is the conduct of special studies of the Federal merit systems and oversight reviews of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

The staff of the Office of Policy and Evaluation carries these reviews and is responsible for:

1. Conducting periodic studies of various aspects of the Federal civil service and other merit systems. These studies are typically governmentwide in scope and the data and information gathered are used to make sound, supportable judgments about the health of the merit systems and to identify opportunities for improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of government operations through better workforce management;

2. An annual review of the "significant actions" of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to determine whether those actions are in accord with the merit system principles and free from prohibited personnel practices;

3. Reviewing rules and regulations of OPM to determine if a regulation on its face, or any agency's policy in conformity with the regulation, results in the commission of a prohibited personnel practice; and

4. Issuing reports and other written or electronic publications that document the results of OPE's studies and oversight activities, including recommendations for improvements. These reports are addressed to Congress and the President and widely disseminated to other interested individuals and organizations.

Outcomes

In order to ensure that the Federal merit systems operate in accord with the merit system principles and are free of systemic prohibited personnel practices, the intended results (outcomes) of OPE's efforts are to:

1. Strengthen the merit system and the effectiveness of Federal HRM by identifying problems with the policies and practices of federal agencies, including OPM, which may compromise adherence to the merit system principles;

2. Have a significant constructive impact on future Federal HRM policies, practices, and programs in the Federal Government in order to foster improvements and to promote and maintain the health of the merit systems; and

3. Identify and encourage the continuation of good or "best" HRM practices that are consistent with the merit system principles.

Goals

Goal   11

Promote And Protect Merit Systems Principles

Protect and promote merit system principles in Federal personnel and workforce management activities through timely and relevant review and analysis of Federal human resource management systems, programs, policies, and initiatives, including the significant activities of the Office of Personnel Management.

Objectives

1. Determine whether OPM and agency human resource management policies and practices are in compliance with the merit principles and conducive to the health of the merit system, and ensure that our stakeholders (particularly the President, Congress, and executive branch policy officials) are aware of those findings.

2. Obtain the maximum constructive impact (relative to resources used) from OPE's studies, reports, and recommendations and avoid any unnecessary duplication of effort with other government organizations (particularly the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM)).

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Reports and Studies

> **OPE Reports And Studies Examine Relevant Programs, Policies And Practices In Order To Evaluate Federal Agencies' Compliance With The Merit Principles And Significant Actions Of OPM.**

Despite a 37 percent decline in resources available to this function compared to 5 years ago, we will maintain the same overall level of publication productivity, i.e., in both FY 2000 and FY 2001 we will issue at least 3 major study reports and 4 editions of the OPE "Issues of Merit" newsletter which updates and highlights issues drawn from the office's body of research gathered over the last 20 years. One of the major reports in FY 2000 will provide an overall assessment of the significant actions of the Office of Personnel Management since its establishment in 1978. The other reports and the subjects covered in the "Issues of Merit" will focus on core merit system subjects, such as the Government's ability to recruit, competitively select, and manage a highly qualified, motivated, and productive workforce.

These official publications (along with outreach efforts involving formal presentations at professional conferences or gatherings, articles written for the professional literature, and so on) will either:

1. Identify issues of concern or problems which compromise the integrity of the federal merit systems and agencies' ability to adhere to the merit system principles, and/or

2. Contain data, analyses, and/or recommendations relevant to developing and maintaining an effective merit-based human resources management system.

Verification that we have selected relevant issues to study and have provided thoughtful analysis of the issues will be found in feedback from stakeholder groups (e.g., federal employees and managers, agency policy officials, congressional staff, academicians with a specialty in public policy or administration). Customer survey items concerning relevance of the issues and thoroughness of the analysis will find that at least 85 percent of our "customers" agree that we have met our goals.

Indicator   2

Federal Policy Makers

> **Federal Policy Makers And Others Find OPE Evaluation Reports And Recommendations Useful**

Utility of the information in our publications is reflected by demand for our materials and in the feedback we receive from our readers. As such, we will see the following in FY 2000:

- Requests to OPE for published reports--as calculated by a combination of written and verbal requests to OPE as well as downloads of OPE reports and newsletters on the Internet--will increase by 2% from the FY 1998 level of approximately 30,000 copies distributed either in hard copy or electronically.

- Number of OPE Reports Requested or Accessed by Year

FY98	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
30,000	30,600	31,212	31,836

- The average response time when a request for a report is received will be within one business day. This will be an improvement over our FY 1993 response time of approximately two business days.

- Feedback received from surveys of our primary stakeholders will show that OPE has maintained at least an 85% "approval rating" (e.g., at least 85% of the customers responding to the survey will agree that OPE has appropriately focused our evaluation efforts on areas of concern to the merit systems; the findings we report are supported by the data we present; our data are well analyzed; and our recommendations are relevant and logical).

Indicator   3

Providing a Unique and Supportable Perspective

> **OPE Studies Efforts Provide A Unique And Supportable Perspective Which Has Not Otherwise Been Provided By Oversight Organizations Such As GAO Or OPM.**

To ensure that there is no undue overlap in our studies or evaluations, the staff will monitor the study and oversight activities of OPM and GAO, as well as with that of non-Federal organizations (e.g., NAPA) which review Federal HR issues. An annual review of GAO, OPM, and other relevant organizations' studies agenda and publications will show that either there is no undue overlap with their work in the subject matter covered, or that MSPB provided new and unique data and analysis relevant to the subject matter covered.

Program Evaluation

1. Track the dissemination of its findings and recommendations through the number of published or electronic copies of its reports that are being requested or accessed. Additionally, the staff will scan the media and professional literature to identify instances where MSPB's products are being cited as authoritative sources of information or analyses, or where our recommendations are being endorsed or suggested.

2. Monitor agency and congressional actions which reflect the impact and results achieved from the information, analyses, and recommendations derived from the studies and oversight function on an annual basis.

3. Conduct periodic customer surveys and focus groups.

Means To Be Used To Verify And Validate Performance Measures

The staff has developed and uses a number of measurement strategies in conjunction with its self-assessment efforts to improve its performance as an organization. As such, we have developed several useful measures to provide us with feedback concerning our performance. Because the essence of our success depends on our ability to influence constructive changes in Federal human resources management policies and practices in keeping with the intent of the statutory merit system principles, it is important that the recipients of our reports and recommendations view them as thorough, useful, and convincing. A periodic survey to obtain the views of our "customers, " therefore, is one measure. The degree to which our findings and recommendations are relied upon and referenced by other agencies, policy officials, researchers, and others (e.g., in the media or professional literature) is another measure. Evidence that policy and program changes have actually occurred or that "best practices" are spreading is another indication. By taking a multifaceted approach to the measurement of these perspectives, we are able to ensure that the assessments we make of our performance are reliable and valid measures of our success.

Survey experts on the staff will be involved in the development and administration of our customer satisfaction surveys to ensure that the effort meets accepted professional survey design, administration, analysis and interpretation standards.

As a second measure of whether our stakeholders are finding our publications relevant, we will systematically collect data on the demand for our publications. This demand can be verified by a physical count of the number of published copies that are requested as well as through statistical data provided by the administrators of the office's website along with periodic input from other websites that load office publications for their viewers.

An annual review of the literature on Federal civil service issues (including issues discussed in OPM and GAO publications) is also conducted to ensure that we are offering a unique perspective on these issues. Our impressions are also periodically corroborated by interviews, focus groups, or formal inquiries to knowledgeable officials in other federal agencies and in non-

federal organizations with involvement in civil service issues (e.g., the National Academy of Public Administration, the International Personnel Management Association, and so on).

Actions to Mitigate Factors Adversely Affecting the Accomplishment of Performance Goals

One factor which can negatively impact the ability to accomplish these performance goals is the occasional situation wherein a proposed final draft report needs to undergo either substantial rewriting or multiple rewrites based on feedback from the MSPB Board Members (or other outside reviewers) who find that draft report either unclear or unsupportable as written. To avoid this situation, the staff of the Office of Policy and Evaluation will actively seek opportunities to involve all stakeholders in a particular study as early as possible in order to anticipate and address any problems or objections prior to drafting the final report.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain reliable data and information about Federal HR programs and operations and the operation of Federal merit systems in general. In the past, such information could be obtained fairly easily through such means as: surveys of the workforce (usually distributed by HRM staff in each department and agency); interrogatories soliciting the experiences and opinions of those in the HR and management arenas; face-to-face interviews with HR specialists and managers; and on-site reviews of personnel records.

Currently, however, we cannot be assured of the help we need in gathering information. A 25 percent reduction in the number of HR staff members, deregulation and decentralization of personnel authorities combined with a centralization of personnel operation activities; outsourcing of HR functions in some agencies; and increased diversity (e.g., one size doesn't fit all) in personnel practices and programs all contribute to an increased difficulty in obtaining and analyzing data and information, despite technological advances such as the ability to share information and ideas quickly over the Internet.

In the interest of ensuring that we are able to obtain the information we need to conduct sound analyses and make useful recommendations about HR issues, we are pursuing more efficient and effective ways of gathering data about HR programs and operations. We are actively seeking to develop new and viable data gathering strategies during FY 2000 that will not be as burdensome for all concerned, but will still provide us with sound data for evaluating HR policies and operations.

BUDGET ACTIVITY - MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Mission

The mission of the Information Resources Management staff is to support the Merit Systems Protection Board through the efficient and cost-effective use of information technology. It is responsible for:

1. Designing, developing, implementing, and maintaining automated information systems that meet the needs of MSPB staff;

2. Operating and managing the MSPB data network including local and wide area networks and connectivity to the Internet;

3. Operating and managing a centralized computer facility comprising multiple LAN servers, data base management software, and electronic mail;

4. Providing MSPB staff with personal computer hardware and software

5. Providing technical support and training;

6. Managing the computer security program; and

7. Managing IT contractual services.

Outcomes

The outcome (results) of the information technology program at MSPB is the availability of appropriate and cost-effective information technology tools to assist agency staff in protecting the merit principles.

Goals

To support MSPB's mission and strategies, the following IRM goals have been established:

1. Achieve the strategic needs of the agency;

2. Satisfy the needs of individual customers;

3. Address internal information technology functions; and

4. Accomplish information technology innovation and learning.

The first two goals address whether the staff is providing the right products and services for MSPB and the latter two goals address how well those products and services are delivered.

Goal   12

Achieve The Strategic Needs Of The Agency

Objectives

1. Implement information technology that will assist the agency in issuing initial decisions within 120 days and decisions on petitions for review within 110 days.

2. Implement information technology that will assist the agency in reducing the amount of resources devoted to resolving disputes.

3. Make the adjudicatory process more understandable and available to MSPB customers.

Strategies

1. Through the use of client-server technology, implement an integrated electronic case file to replace the existing Case Management System and integrate case management with document preparation and storage.

2. Increase data sharing among components of the integrated electronic case file and between new systems and Lotus Notes, thus reducing redundant data entry and case processing costs.

3. Implement computer systems that are easier to maintain and modify thus reducing agency costs.

4. Provide capabilities for appellants to file appeals electronically and for case documents to be received and distributed electronically using the Internet.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Using Data from Databases

Number Of Document Templates Using Data Directly From CMS or Lotus Notes Databases, Where Data Sharing Is Applicable			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Document Templates	16	80	90

Indicator   2

Time to Modify Standard Board Documents

Amount Of Time Required To Modify Text In Standard Board Documents (Compared To Amount Of Time Required In Existing System)			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Hours	20	5	4

Indicator 3

Documents Available in Electronic Case File

Percent Of MSPB Case Documents Available In An Electronic Case File			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Percent	0	40%	50%

Program Evaluation

As the new systems are implemented, data concerning the number of documents integrated with case management or other data will be compared with the number currently integrated. Data for the current documents will be obtained from CMS statistics showing the number of documents generated by CMS (counted as the number of templates that will replace them, i.e., if 12 CMS Acknowledgment Orders are being replaced by 1 template in HotDocs, it is counted as 1 document in FY98) plus Microsoft Word documents that already use CMS data, such as the Case Memo. The time required for recent modifications of standard Board documents will be compared to the time required in the new system. As the document management system is implemented to store case documents electronically, the number of documents in the new system will be compared to the number of documents in a sample case files.

Goal 13

Satisfy Needs Of Individual Customers

Objectives

1. Improve accessibility to information systems and the data contained in the systems.

2. Increase IRM awareness of and responsiveness to user needs.

3. Use technology to increase customer satisfaction with IRM services.

Strategies

1. Introduce new systems in a phased approach to promote user acceptance and gain experience with the new technology.

2. Utilize the "user-friendly" capabilities of personal computers and client software (use of the mouse, buttons, drop-down lists, menus, etc.) to make information systems easier to use and the data in those systems more accessible for end-user query and reporting.

3. Increase face-to-face contact between users and IRM staff through visits to regional offices and working sessions.

4. Replace paper-based forms and approval cycles with computer applications for procurement requests, personnel requests, awards, training, requests for administrative services, and similar processes.

5. Implement computer-based document libraries to provide easy and immediate access to documents currently in paper form or scattered among several systems, network shares, directories and subdirectories.

6. Provide flexiplace users with laptop computers/docking stations to provide maximum support and access to MSPB systems with reduced expense and effort by employees.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Staffing Using CMS

Percent Of MSPB Staff Using CMS On A Regular Basis			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Percent	25%	65%	75%

Indicator   2

Reports/Graphs Independently Prepared

Number Of Reports/Graphs Prepared By MSPB Staff Independently Of IRM			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Reports/Graphs	0	100	200

Indicator   3

Days in Regional Offices

Number Of Days Spent In Regional Offices Analyzing Needs And Responding To User Concerns

Item/Fiscal Year	FY99	FY00	FY01
Days	30	35	40

Indicator 4

Replacement of Paper Based Systems

Number Of Computer Applications Replacing Paper-Based Systems			
Item/Fiscal Year	FY99	FY00	FY01
Applications	2	5	8

Indicator 5

Deployment of Docking Stations

Percent Of Flexiplace Employees With Laptop/Docking Stations			
Item/Fiscal Year	FY99	FY00	FY01
Percent	7%	100%	100%

Program Evaluation

As new systems are implemented, data concerning their use will be compared with comparable statistics for current systems. Monitoring systems will be implemented to count visits to regional offices, new computer applications, and use of laptop/docking stations.

Goal **14**

Address Internal Information Technology Functions

Objectives

1. Reduce the time required to implement new systems.

2. Reduce the cost and/or staff resources required to maintain systems.

3. Maximize access to information system capabilities by HQ, regional, and flexiplace users during normal work hours.

4. Ensure that all hardware, software, networks, and applications are Y2K compliant.

Strategies

1. Use off-the-shelf software and outside services to reduce the elapsed time and IRM staff time for new systems implementation.

2. Use technology to improve internal IRM effectiveness, such as using an automated software distribution system to install software rather than physically visiting each PC to install.

3. Provide adequate backup and recovery services to maintain uninterrupted service to customers.

4. Modify application software, upgrade system software, and modify/replace hardware as needed for Y2K compliance.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

System Uptime

Percent Uptime By System (Notes, CMS, DMS, DAS, Legal Research, LAN Shares) And Location Of User (HQ, Region, Flexiplace)			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Percent	98%	99%	99%

Indicator   2

Problems Solving and Remote Installs

Number Of Problems Resolved Or Installs Completed Remotely			
Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Problems/Installs	30	75	100

Indicator   3

Time to Complete Upgrades

Amount Of Time And/Or Elapsed Time Required To Upgrade PC's			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Hours	4	3	2

Indicator   4

Y2K

Number of Y2K Problems Surfacing After 1/1/2000			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Problems	n/a	0	0

Program Evaluation

Statistics currently maintained on system availability and installation will be used to establish a baseline and will be compared against statistics for new systems. Y2K problems will be monitored.

Goal **15**

Accomplish Information Technology Innovation, Training, And Learning

Objectives

1. Maximize effective use of information technology through training and on-line resources.

2. Maintain currency in information technologies.

Strategies

1. Provide end-user classroom training for all new systems.

2. Send staff to technical training for new technologies and software.

3. Purchase or develop interactive training modules that can be used by MSPB staff on their own time, as refresher training and for new employees (both end-user and IRM technical training).

4. Maintain user guides and other software documentation in on-line libraries (both for end-users and for technical staff)

5. Promote sharing of knowledge by MSPB staff through Lotus Notes discussion databases and working meetings.

6. Evaluate new technology for applicability to MSPB environment and needs.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

New Technology

Percent Of Staff Receiving Classroom Training In New Technologies			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Percent	60%	90%	100%

Indicator   2

On-line Training

Percent Of Applications Where On-Line Training Is Available

Item/Fiscal Year	FY99	FY00	FY01
Percent	15%	45%	50%

Indicator 3

On-Line Documentation

Percent Of Applications Where On-Line Documentation Is Available			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Percent	75%	80%	90%

Indicator 4

New Products or Technologies

Number Of New Products Or Technologies Evaluated By IRM Staff			
Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
New Technologies	3	5	8

Program Evaluation

Existing data on training and on-line documentation will be used as a baseline to compare against comparable statistics with the new systems. Exploration of new technologies will be monitored and counted.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Mission

The Office of Equal Employment Opportunity's mission is to promote equal opportunity in employment by enforcing the Federal civil rights employment laws through administrative actions, education and technical assistance.

OEEO accomplishes its mission through a staff of 1.5 employees. OEEO is responsible for the enforcement of key Federal statutes prohibiting discrimination in the workplace:

1. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin or retaliation;

2. The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, which protects those age 40 and over from discrimination;

3. The Equal Pay Act of 1963, which prohibits sex-based wage discrimination between men and women in the same establishment who are performing equal work under similar working conditions; and,

4. Sections 501 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, which prohibits employment discrimination against people with disabilities in the Federal sector.

The OEEO's mission includes a wide range of activities designed to promote equal opportunity in employment through the enforcement of the Federal laws prohibiting discrimination in employment. Significant functions associated with the administrative actions of enforcing the laws include:

1. Counseling, investigation, adjudication, settlement and conciliation of complaints; resolving complaints using other forms of alternative dispute resolution; and,

2. Educational and technical assistance, i.e., outreach to employees, training sessions, and information and guidance on employment discrimination issues and law, and affirmative employment issues.

In addition, the OEEO is tasked with the responsibility of overseeing and monitoring the MSPB's Career Transition Center (CTC). The mission of the CTC is to maintain current self-directed employment computer programs to assist MSPB employees who are attempting to transition to other employment opportunities.

Outcomes

The intended outcomes of the OEEO's Federal civil rights efforts are to ensure that:

1. Former and present employees and applicants for employment are aware of their EEO rights and responsibilities;

2. Counselings are conducted in a timely and legally sufficient manner;

3. Complaints are resolved at the earliest opportunity;

4. Investigations are conducted in a timely and legally sufficient manner;

5. Resolutions are fair, impartial, and appropriate;

6. Decisions are impartial/based solely on the evidentiary record and legally sufficient;

7. EEOC hearings requested by complainants are properly and promptly facilitated;

8. EEOC appeals are properly coordinated and all issues are addressed; and,

9. MSPB's workforce is reflective of the population as a whole.

The intended outcome of the OEEO's CTC effort is to ensure that employees are provided access to necessary tools to assist them in their self-directed job search.

Goals

Goal   **16**

Efficiently Produce And Deliver Quality Work Products

Objectives

1. Efficiently process counseling and complaints of discrimination.

2. Develop data base to accurately capture timeliness of case processing sequence.

3. Timely revise MSPB's implementing regulations, when necessary, to conform with EEOC's changes to 29 CFR 1614 and management directive.

4. Efficiently conduct a review of MSPB's recruitment policy, procedure, practice and make any necessary recommendations.

5. Efficiently review MSPB's electronic information systems to determine that EEO information is included, easy to read, and accessible, and make any necessary recommendations.

6. Efficiently assess and address Career Transition Center users' needs.

Performance Measures**:**

Indicator   1

Counseling

Percentage Of Counseling Completed Within 30 Days Of Initial Contact With A Counselor			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Percentage	40	80	85

Beginning use of a Full-Time EEO Counselor should produce improvements in both the quality and timeliness of EEO counseling actions.

Indicator 2

Complaints Closed

Percentage Of Complaints Investigated/Closed Within 180 Days From Filing			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Percentage	70	80	85

Program Evaluation

Performance measures will be obtained from information collected by (soon to be developed) counseling/complaint data base, and by periodic assessment and users' surveys.

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT

Mission

Provide Financial, Administrative and Personnel support to MSPB to assist in promoting:

1. Fair, timely, and efficient dispute resolution; and

2. Timely and relevant review of Federal human resource management systems, programs, policies, and initiatives.

Outcomes

Offices throughout MSPB have sufficient and increasingly more efficient resources to support their missions.

Goals

Goal 17

Manage The MSPB Budgetary Process To Ensure The Availability Of Funds To Support Major Missions And Spending Priorities

Objectives

Ensure individual office have needed funds to operate on a daily basis and that MSPB has needed funds to support short and long range improvement efforts.

Strategies

1. Budgets sent to OMB in September and Congress in February accurately reflect MSPB's needs and are well written, complete, accurate, and timely.

2. Available funds are allocated efficiently, to reflect agency priorities, and adjustments are made timely when needed.

3. Needed adjustments to the allocations are made as necessary.

4. All of the funds made available are efficiently used.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Budgets

Budget			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Requests Submitted	On-Time	On-Time	On-Time
Supplementals	Requested as needed to support unplanned/ unfunded needs	Requested as needed to support unplanned/ unfunded needs	Requested as needed to support unplanned/ unfunded needs
Allocations	Presented to Chief of Staff 30 days of Appropriation	Presented within 30 days of Appropriation	Presented within 30 days of Appropriation

We will describe how allocations were developed in response to overall agency policy determinations.

Program Evaluation

We will record the dates of budget submissions and comments received from OMB, Congress, and our other customers.

Goal **18**

Improve Services, Reduce Costs And Save Time In Provision Of Services

Objectives

Reduce the time and expense associated with the provision of administrative services while improving their overall quality.

Strategies

1. Improve voice communications thorough use of digital technology;

2. Reduce costs by making effective use of the FTS2001 contract;

3. Improve video-conferencing by ensuring all systems have same software versions.

4. Explore new video technologies such as desk top and implement where it is appropriate and cost effective.

5. Improve the T&A process by working with Kronos to improve the system and to expand use of Kronos to other offices not currently using it, if appropriate.

6. Improve the timelines and accessibility of financial data for use by FAMD and individual offices.

7. Ensure MSPB makes use of the latest systems and technologies available to us from NFC and ABS.

8. Reduce financial reporting requirements without adversely impacting budget execution.

9. Automate as many administrative systems and processes as possible including such things as processing credit cards, assisting travel payments, improving budget data.

10. Use the Internet to secure and disseminate procurement and related information.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Improve Voice and Video Communications

Improve Voice and Video Communications			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**

Telecommunications, Long Distance Bills	$50,000 per month	$45,000 per month	$40,000 per month
Digital Voice System	Installed in 2 Offices	Installed in 4 Offices	Installed in 6 Offices
Video Software Venue	4 versions	4 versions	Single Version
New Video Tech.	None	Pilot desk-top	Install Desk-top

Indicator   2

Improve the T&A Process

Improve the T&A Process			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Offices using Kronos	5	10	All
RO/FO's Using Winframe	None	5	10
Errors due to Kronos software problems	Anecdotal	Measure problems by Pay Period	Measure problems by Pay Period
Provide "on-line" training	None	Pilot use of Notes Screen-Camera	Implement

Indicator   3

Make Financial Information Readily Available

Make Financial Information Readily Available			
Item	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Convert NFC reports from paper to electronic	Ceiling and DTR reports (partial)	Add Budget and 113	Add billing reports

Get reports into Lotus Notes Database	None	All	All

Indicator   4

Improve Credit Card Program

Improve Credit Card Program			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Reduce PO's	50 annually	25 annually	25 annually
Provide "on-line" training to card holders	None	Pilot use of Notes Screen-Camera	Implement
Install NFC software upgrades	As Available	Request new features from NFC	Request new features from NFC

Indicator   5

Simplify Travel Payment Systems

Simplify Travel Payment System			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Expand use of central payments	None	Common Carrier	Add Lodging

Indicator 6

Make Use of the Internet

Make Use of the Internet			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Publish an FAM "Homepage"	None	Initial	Full implementation
Collect and use information from Internet	None	Educational Equipment	Add Court reporting

Program Evaluation

We will examine various types of billing and cost information as well as monitoring total orders process and percent processed via credit card and other electronic means.

We will perform a customer survey to determine needs for training and information needs.

Goal **19**

Ensure Management Systems Have Sound Internal And Management Controls

Objectives

We provide adequate review of internal systems to identify potential vulnerabilities and assure that we have reasonable safeguards in place.

We provide adequate review of management controls to identify potential vulnerabilities and assure that we have reasonable safeguards in place.

Strategies

1. We will determine which areas should be studied in depth and procure contractor assistance in performing the studies.

2. We will analyze the recommendations made by the consultants and take appropriate follow-up action.

3. We will maintain a multi-year schedule so assure that all the important areas are covered in a systematic way.

4. We will provide accurate and timely information in our annual report to OMB.

Performance Measures

Indicator   1

Internal and Management Controls

Internal and Management Controls			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Conduct IC Reviews	Computer Security	Travel, Procurement and Credit Cards	General Ledger, T&A, Travel

Program Evaluation

We will conduct reviews in accord with Generally Accepted and Government standards.

Goal   **20**

Providing Effective And Efficient Personnel Management Services

Objectives

Provide human resource management services and information that meet the needs of MSPB managers, supervisors and employees.

Strategies

1. The cost of services provided by APHIS continues to be less expensive than having in house staff perform the work.

2. Information, services, and material from OPM and APHIS are provided timely to MSPB staff.

3. Services provided by APHIS are of high quality and are timely.

4. Special services, such as retirement counseling, are provided as needed.

5. Review the range of services provided and expand APHIS' role as possible and necessary.

6. Work with APHIS to identify and correct any problem issues regarding quality and timeliness.

Performance Measures

Indicator 1

Cost and Range of Services

Cost and Range of Services			
Item/Fiscal Year	**FY99**	**FY00**	**FY01**
Cost of HR Services	$1,000,000 pre APHIS	Under $200,000	Under $200,000
Range of Services provided	Current range of services	Consider adding Drug Testing	Consider adding EAP and Health Units
Timeliness of services	APHIS workload measures	Measure against 1st year benchmark	Adjust Benchmarks as appropriate

We will measure the timeliness of services using APHIS' workload measures and will seek to understand the cause of any problem areas. These will then be addressed with APHIS and/or MSPB staff.

Program Evaluation

We will record the results of timeliness measures and compare them with the base we are establishing.

We will consult with other offices and employees within MSPB to gauge their perceptions of service levels.